SEP 2 2 2006

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006, OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Parametre duction	Act of 1995, no nemor	U.S. I	Patent and Tr	rademark	Office: L	J.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE displays a valid OMB control number.	
TRANSMITTAL FORM		Application Number	1	10/606,133			
		Filing Date	June 25, 20	June 25, 2003			
		First Named Inventor	Paolo Fortina				
		Art Unit	1634				
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)		Examiner Name Diana B. Johann			nsen		
Total Number of Pages in This Submission 5		Attorney Docket Number		CHOP.0182US			
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)  After Allowance Communication to TC							
Fee Transmittal Form		Drawing(s)			Ailer	diowance Communication to 10	
Fee Attached		Licensing-related Papers				eal Communication to Board opeals and Interferences	
Amendment/Reply  After Final  Affidavits/declarati  Extension of Time Request  Express Abandonment Reformation Disclosure State  Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)  Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Funder 37 CFR 1.5	Rema Rema In the Con Account	ne event the that a fee is requ	Address  O  ired in connarce such f	ee to the	Propries Status Other below	submission and not enclosed, nt of the undersigned attomeys,	
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT							
Firm Name  DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL AND SKILLMAN - Cusotmer No. 000110							
Signature Moht ( Mith 1)							
Printed name Robert C. Netter, Jr., Ph.D.							
Date         September 20, 2006         Reg. No.         56,422							
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING  I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with							
sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:							
Signature C. Boyan							
Typed or printed name Jane C. Bogan					Date	September 20, 2006	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SEP 2 2 2006 Art Unit: 1634

Examiner: Diana B. Johannsen

ur File No: CHOP.0182US

In re the Application of

Paolo Fortina et al.

Serial No. 10/606,133

Filed: June 25, 2003

For: "Methods for Detection of)

Genetic Alterations
Associated with Cancer"

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT RESPONSE AND STATEMENT OF
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

In the paper dated August 30, 2006, the Examiner contends that the June 13, 2006 Official Action response is not fully responsive to the March 13, 2006 Official Action because the claims encompassed by the elected invention are not identified.

Applicants continue to traverse the restriction requirement set forth in the March 13, 2006 Official Action for the reasons stated in the June 13, 2006 Official Action response. Indeed, an objective reading of the claims reveals that they are drawn to closely related subject matter and, therefore, do not comprise separate and distinct inventions. Furthermore, Applicants note that the MPEP at §803.02 states that "in applications containing a Markush-type claim that encompasses at least two independent or distinct inventions, the examiner may require a provisional election of a single species prior to examination on the merits." Accordingly, should the Examiner determine that a restriction must be made, Applicants respectfully submit that a requirement for an election of species is clearly more appropriate as it is more consistent with the guidance provided in the MPEP than a restriction requirement. Moreover, an election of species would be less onerous for Applicants and would allow for the

examination of the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention.

To be fully responsive to the Office communication dated August 30, 2006, Applicants elect, with traverse, the genetic alteration of deletion. All of the claims (i.e., claims 1-8) read on the elected invention.

It is believed that the present submission is fully responsive to the issues raised in the paper dated August 30, 2006. It is noted that a shortened statutory response period of one (1) month was set forth in the August 30, 2006 Official Action. Therefore, the initial due date for response is September 30, 2006.

## STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

This Statement of Substance of Interview is being submitted in accordance with §713.04 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure to make of record a telephone interview held between Examiner Diana Johannsen, Kate Rigaut (PTO Registration No. 43,047), and the undersigned on or about September 18, 2006.

A telephone interview was held on or about September 18, 2006 between the undersigned, Kate Rigaut, and Examiner Johannsen for the purpose of clarifying the March 13, 2006 Official Action and the August 30, 2006 Office Communication. At the outset, the undersigned sought clarification of the March 13, 2006 restriction requirement with regard to the groups of invention from which Applicants were required to elect. Examiner Johannsen apologized for the general lack of clarity in the restriction requirement and explained that claim 1 would be examined as presented and to its full breadth, regardless of the invention elected. The undersigned also stated that Applicants continue to disagree with the restriction requirement for the reasons made of record in the June 13, 2006 Official Action response. Examiner Johannsen

indicated that the arguments set forth in the response to the restriction requirement had not been fully considered. However, Examiner Johannsen also stated that the restriction requirement would be reconsidered, particularly with regard to whether an election of species or invention should be required, in view of recent guidance provided at the USPTO. The undersigned agreed to file the instant response to the August 30, 2006 Office Communication with the understanding that Examiner Johannsen would reconsider the restriction requirement issued March 13, 2006.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention represents an advance in the art of mutation detection. Accordingly, early and favorable action on this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
DANN DORFMAN HERRELL and SKILLMAN, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

D17

Robert C. Netter, Jr., Ph.D.

PTO Registration No. 56,422

Telephone: (215) 563-4100